

City of Newton, Massachusetts

Department of Planning and Development 1000 Commonwealth Avenue Newton, Massachusetts 02459

Telephone (617) 796-1120 Telefax (617) 796-1142 TDD/TTY (617) 796-1089 www.newtonma.gov

Candace Havens Director

MEMORANDUM

DATE: June 6, 2014

TO: Alderman Marcia T. Johnson, Chairman

Members of the Zoning and Planning Committee

Candace Havens, Director of Planning and Development FROM:

James Freas, Chief Planner, Long-Range Planning

#80-13: THE PLANNING DEPARTMENT requesting update discussions of the RE:

zoning reform project.

MEETING DATE: June 9, 2014

CC: **Board of Aldermen**

> Planning and Development Board Donnalyn Kahn, City Solicitor

One of the primary objectives of Phase 1 of Zoning Reform is to address the conflicting provisions in the existing Newton Zoning Ordinance. A number of these are presented below with the applicable section numbers in the old and new Zoning Ordinances and staff recommendations for resolution.

	Issue	Old Z.O. Citations	Recommendation
1	Side setback requirements in	30-15, Table 3	Greatest restriction provided where
	business districts		abutting a residential district,
			otherwise use setbacks provided in
			the table.
2	Rear setback requirements in	30-15, Table 3	Greatest restriction provided where
	business districts		abutting a residential district,
			otherwise use setbacks provided in
			the table.
3	Home Businesses in Multi-	30-9 and 30-8	Allow home businesses by right in MR
	Residential Districts		districts subject to listed standards.
4	Swimming Pools & Tennis Courts;	30-1, <i>Space</i> ,	Remove Swimming Pools and Tennis
	Open Space or Structures	Useable Open &	Courts from the Open Space

		Structure	definition.
5	Number of parking stalls allowed	30-19(d)(1) & 30-	Allow 2 tandem parking spaces within
	in the side setback in Single	19(g)(1)	the side setback.
	Residence Districts		
6	View obstruction traffic hazard	30-15(g) & 5-	Change Chief of Police to City Traffic
		30(f)(7)	Engineer

Issues #1 & 2

The system of numbers provided within this table, modified by the footnotes provided below it, is confusing and directly contradictory. For example, for a building located in the Business 1 District abutting a property in a non residential district, the rear setback is either '0 feet' or "1/2 the building height or 20 feet, whichever is greater." If that property were to abut a Public Use district, a third option of "1/2 the building height or 15 feet, whichever is greater" is introduced. Where a commercial property is next to a residential district staff recommends using the greater restriction provided for in the footnotes. Otherwise, staff recommends using the setbacks provided in the table.

Issue #3

Section 30-9(a)(1) allows all by-right uses in the Single Residence Districts (Sec 30-8) as by-right uses in the Multi-Residence Districts. Home businesses are allowed by right in the Single Residence Districts according to 30-8(a)(4), subject to standards. Section 30-9(b)(6) indicates that a special permit is required for home businesses in Multi-Residence Districts. Staff recommends that home businesses be allowed by right in the Multi-Residence Districts subject to the listed standards.

Issue #4

Tennis Courts and Swimming Pools cannot be both structures and open space as one is subject to setbacks and the other is not. Note, this item is the subject (partially) of docket item #216-12.

Issue #5

Section 30-19(g) allows one parking space on a single- or two-family lot to be located within a setback while section 30-19(d) allows two parking spaces on such lots to be located within the side setback in tandem. Staff recommends the two sections be reconciled to allow two tandem parking spaces within the side yard setback.

Issue#6

The City Fence Ordinance in section 5-30 empowers the City Traffic Engineer to determine whether a fence obstructs the view at intersections and, therefore, constitutes a traffic hazard. The Zoning Ordinance gives the same authority to the Chief of Police, more broadly applying it to any obstruction within the setback. For consistency, one City position should have the authority to mitigate traffic hazards by maintaining adequate views. Staff recommends the City Traffic Engineer be charged with the authority to make these determinations.